



TRINITY CITY COUNCIL
Annual Retreat
Saturday, February 03, 2007
8:30 a.m.

The Trinity City Council held their Annual Retreat on Saturday, February 03, 2007 at the Radisson Hotel in High Point, NC for the purpose of discussing the following items listed on the Agenda. A quorum was present.

Members Present: Mayor Fran Andrews, Council members Karen Bridges, Barbara Ewings, Bob Labonte, Barry Lambeth, Dwight Meredith, Edith Reddick, and Miles Talbert.

Members Absent: Council member Phil Brown.

OTHERS PRESENT: Retreat Facilitator, Ginger Booker, PTCOG; City Manager, Ann Bailie; Attorney Bob Wilhoit; City Engineer, Randy McNeill; Planning Administrator, Adam Stumb; City Clerk/Finance Officer, Debbie Hinson, Assistant City Clerk and Special Projects Coordinator, Diana Schreiber; news media, and other interested parties.

Welcome and Call to Order

Mayor Andrews called the Annual 2007 Retreat of the Trinity City Council to Order at 8:30 am, Saturday, February 03, 2007, welcomed everyone present, and turned the meeting over to Ms. Ginger Booker, Facilitator, PTCOG.

Review Agenda

Ms. Booker reviewed the tentative Agenda she had prepared with Council for changes, additions, or deletions.

Manager Bailie advised Council that she felt that it may be appropriate to have a discussion during this meeting concerning annexation. It was her opinion that this item fit in with strategic issues. She discussed annexation items that Council had dealt with along with the annexation issue included on the February Council Agenda for consideration. Discussion on this item will give staff some direction for the future and will also allow discussion to see if there is a shared vision among Council for annexation.

After discussion, it was the consensus of Council to incorporate Annexation into the agenda after discussion of ETJ.

Ground Rules

Ms. Booker reviewed and discussed the Ground Rules with Council members and how each one worked. With no other discussion, Ms. Booker proceeded with the Agenda as presented with the addition Annexation as an added item to the Agenda.

Strategic Issues

Extraterritorial Jurisdiction

Ms. Booker opened this item and advised Council that she had provided a handout that reviewed the procedures for Extra Territorial Jurisdiction and advised Council that she had brought a copy of the General Statute if Council had questions concerning this handout. At this time, Ms. Booker asked Mr. Stumb for any additional information that he may have that could be provided to Council members.

At this time, Mr. Stumb passed out maps that dealt with the surrounding ETJ areas of Trinity.

Mr. Stumb advised Council that the 2 yellow areas represented the City of Archdale with the darker of the 2 being Archdale City Limits and the lighter yellow representing their ETJ. They have gone beyond the one-mile limit and have extended their ETJ to Fairview Church Road.

The brown on this map represents the City limits of High Point as well as their ETJ and as shown represents everything down to business I-85 and some areas beyond that point up to the City Limits of Trinity.

The only area of the City of Thomasville located in Randolph County is the Breckenridge Subdivision and Colonial Village. Their ETJ stops at the county line in most cases. This does not mean they could not go beyond this at some point into Randolph County.

The light green area shown on the map represents the exact mile of ETJ that the City of Trinity could incorporate. The boundary must follow a property line, street, or creek and must be something that the average citizen will be able to identify in order to know if they are located within the ETJ.

Mr. Stumb reviewed the process to establish ETJ as listed on the handout from Ms. Booker listed below:

EXTRA TERRITORIAL JURISDICTION PROCEDURES

What ETJ Means - Extraterritorial jurisdiction (ETJ) means that a town may exercise certain planning related powers in an area adjacent to its municipal limits if the town already enforces those powers within its municipal boundary. The "planning related" powers are those covered under GS 160A, Article 19 including: zoning, subdivision, flood control, erosion and sedimentation control, historic district designation and planning, building inspection, minimum housing standards, open space acquisition and planning, community development, and community appearance and beautification.

Geographic Scope - For towns with a population up to 10,000, ETJ extends one mile. It may extend two miles if the town's population is 10,000 - 25,000; and a maximum of three miles if the population is over 25,000.

Rationale - The way an area adjacent to a town develops can significantly affect the town. Development can change the character of adjoining properties or neighborhoods, increase demand for municipal services, affect traffic patterns and impact surrounding property values. For these reasons, in 1959 virtually all NC towns were granted statutory authority to extend zoning and related powers to the area immediately outside their city limits.

The Process

1. Determine the ETJ boundary and produce a map. The boundary must be clearly defined by rivers, roads property boundaries, etc. so that people can tell whether their property is in the ETJ. A survey is not required but is often done.
2. Initiate process of seeking county approval where applicable. Within first mile, county approval is required only if county exercises all three land-use tools - zoning, subdivision and building inspection. Beyond one mile, county approval is always required.

- a) First contact may be informally between city/ county managers or between planners.
 - b) City follows with a formal request for county approval. This may but does not have to be a council resolution. A letter from the mayor on behalf of the city is also fine. A map of the proposed ETJ area should be included. County Commissioners must adopt a resolution.
3. Draft an ETJ ordinance incorporating the map.
4. Set the date for a public hearing. (City may have one hearing combining both the ETJ boundary ordinance and application of zoning classifications to the area. Or it may have two hearings, one for the ETJ boundary and one for application of zoning.)
5. Provide notice of the hearing(s):
 - a) Newspaper Notice - For each public hearing, notice must run once a week for two successive weeks, with first notice at least 10 but no more than 25 days before the hearing.
 - b) Mailed Notice on ETJ Boundary Ordinance - First class notice is mailed to all affected property owners at least 4 weeks before the public hearing. *(Notice must also explain the effects of the extension of jurisdiction and advise recipients of right to have extraterritorial representation on the town's planning board and board of adjustment.)*
 - c) Mailed Notice on Application of Zoning - First class notice is mailed to all affected property owners at least 10 days but no more than 20 days before the public hearing. *(This is less than the 4 week notice for the boundary ordinance mailing. So two mailings are necessary even if the city holds one public hearing combining both issues.)*
6. Adopt ordinance. (County resolution of approval required beforehand.)
7. File copy of adopted map with city clerk and register of deeds.
8. Amend existing zoning map to apply zoning to new territory if this was not done earlier.
9. Provide for representation of residents of ETJ on planning board and board of adjustment.

Prepared by the Piedmont Triad Council of Governments -November 2003

There was discussion concerning the green located between the yellow sections representing Archdale and who these areas belonged to. Mr. Stumb advised Council members that Archdale did not accept these areas into their ETJ when the ETJ was developed.

Mr. McNeill discussed the school site and where the boundary was located on this property. The other area that Mr. McNeill discussed was the area that could possibly be the site for a treatment plant on the Uwharrie River. The drainage basin for this site would bring everything from Archdale Road over to the 1 mile line as far as potential gravity service area above the location of the treatment plant location. There was a brief discussion between members and Mr. McNeill regarding where other areas along Archdale Road would be served. Mr. McNeill explained the dividing ridge line located in this area that split service to the Uwharrie river basin and the Caraway Creek area basin.

Council member Meredith asked if the map provided to Council ended at the Davidson County line. Mr. Stumb advised Council that the 1 mile distance would cross the Randolph County line. As I discussed earlier, the current ETJ for the City of Thomasville comes up to the County Line.

Council member Meredith asked what the objective was for Trinity establishing an ETJ. He discussed his feelings on allowing the City of Thomasville to annex in their area next to the Davidson County/Randolph County Line since there was a considerable amount of mobile homes located in this area. Also discussed was where the boundary lines for the City of Archdale was located in comparison to the City Limits of Trinity and the effect that an addition of an ETJ would have if pursued.

Council member Meredith discussed services that would need to be provided by the City of Trinity if an ETJ was established. It was his feeling that if the City considered establishing an ETJ they should think about where an ETJ was needed and not include all of the area as shown on the map. Council member Lambeth discussed what he felt prompted this item to be considered.

There was conversation among Council members and Ms. Booker concerning the planning related issues that went along with establishing an ETJ. Ms. Booker discussed Randolph County's position concerning ETJ advising Council members they did not want to enter into conversations with a city concerning ETJ until that City has a Land Use Plan that includes their ETJ. Randolph County does have a Land Use Plan by which it makes determinations for areas that will be covered by the County Zoning. Therefore, if you were to take an area into your ETJ the County wants to know what your Land Use Plan is for this area. Currently your Land Use Plan will be somewhat similar to the County's but it may change in the future.

Attorney Wilhoit advised Council that normally in an ETJ a City could apply all of its Land Use Ordinances. One of the concerns of the citizens located within an ETJ is that they do not want any less protection than they already have under the County Ordinance.

There was further discussion among Council members concerning the need to communicate with the County, reviewing surrounding city ETJs, how citizens may react to being encompassed into an ETJ and the service that may be required of the city that wishes to bring these citizens into their ETJ.

Ms. Booker discussed information that set the context for ETJ found in a book from the Institute of Government on Municipal Zoning. There is a small paragraph on City extraterritorial jurisdiction that reads as follows:

"the way and area immediately outside a City is developed can dramatically affect the City. Development can change the character of neighborhoods, increase the demand for city services, change the city's traffic patterns and affect surrounding property values. In many instances nearby areas will eventually be part of the city. Because of these impacts in 1959 virtually all North Carolina cities were granted the authority to extend city zoning to the area immediately outside of their city limit."

Ms. Booker discussed how persons being considered for incorporation into a city ETJ already lived under a Land Use Plan and zoning regulations. The degree to which you want to proactively plan for their influence in Trinity would be the reason that you would extend ETJ. This will be an additional work burden on your city staff.

Ms. Booker and Council members discussed any steps that they wanted to take or direct the staff to take related to ETJ.

Council member Meredith discussed conversations from an earlier meeting with an adjoining municipality concerning the area along the Uwharrie River and it was his opinion that it was important to the City of Trinity. He did not feel that other areas discussed were as important because the City of Trinity will be trying to take care of what was already located in the corporate boundary for the next 20 to 25 years. Council member Lambeth agreed with Council member Meredith concerning the area discussed along the Uwharrie.

Mr. McNeill discussed the area that Council members were referring to along the Uwharrie. If both the City of Trinity and the City of Archdale were to put a regional treatment plant that both municipalities owned there will need to be a service area agreement worked out. This will dictate what each city will serve, and which city will receive the revenues and from what part. The annexations will be in the future when some land is developed. It was his opinion that the City of Archdale would not extend their ETJ until they had the ability to provide services.

Mr. Stumb advised Council that if Archdale were to annex the area discussed they would have to provide sewer services to the entire area that they annexed as well as any other services that they provide to other citizens already located in their city limits.

Manager Bailie advised Council that from conversations concerning this topic she felt Council was mostly interested in protecting the east side. She asked if Council would like for Mr. Stumb to come back to Council with a more detailed map that actually follows some lines that are more accurate to the areas you have discussed.

Mr. McNeill discussed another area located from Kennedy Road, north, to Red Fox, to Meadowbrook and the proximity of these areas to the existing city limits. At some point if the treatment plant is built in the area discussed, the sewers can be diverted by gravity and the City of Trinity would be installing sewer service into an area that is not located in the City Limits. You would have no control over what would be developed in this area unless it was incorporated into your city limits.

Council member Ewings asked for clarification on services that would have to be provided to areas that were incorporated into the ETJ. She asked if persons in these areas would receive amenities immediately upon being placed into the ETJ.

Ms. Booker advised Council members that ETJ did not require that services be provided to citizens incorporated into the area of the ETJ, however, annexation did require that services be provided in 2 years. Manager Bailie advised Council that voluntary annexation did not require that services be provided. Forced Annexation does require services be provided at the same level that the city provides to other residents.

At the end of discussion the following consensus was reached:

- *Council interest was in protecting the eastside more than other areas discussed*
- *Mr. Stumb was to come back with a more detail map for discussion on the area taking into consideration sewer treatment benefits*
- *For Mr. Stumb to also include Kennedy Road, north, from Red Fox Road to Meadowbrook*

Annexation

Ms. Booker began this conversation by asking Council how they applied criteria and framework in order to make your decision about voluntary annexation. What criteria do you use?

Council member Lambeth felt that when a request for Voluntary Annexation came before Council that a **(fully detailed plan)** as much detail as needed prior to consideration by Council that would include such information as how many houses did the request include, what zoning request would be made for the property, streets, services, sidewalks, etc. It was his suggestion that everything the developer want to do needed to be provided to Council. This prevents second guessing.

Ms. Booker discussed the challenging issue before Council concerning sewer services. She discussed the scenario that would have a proposed area for annexation where the developer proposes to provide sewer, but in fact, there are many existing areas of the City that did not have sewer. Is this a good thing because the developer will provide sewer and it may open up other areas for development or sewer extensions as well as saving the City some money or is it a bad thing since the new area will be getting sewer prior to other areas of the City that are still years away from obtaining sewer service.

Council member Lambeth discussed his opinion on this topic. This is both a benefit and problem. If the developer installs the sewer, revenues will be generated to keep the sewer projects already planned on target. If this type of development is stopped the revenues will be stopped. He discussed his location and the likelihood of not receiving sewer during his lifetime in this area and how he understood this was a problem with some persons that lived in the City. However, this is not what the City is about. We need to be about what services we can provide for everyone. Increased revenues will allow us to provide the services sooner.

Council members discussed their experience concerning citizen complaints received dealing with services being provided to an annexed area prior to service being provided to them the current resident.

Council member Lambeth felt that public education would benefit the public. This will help the City explain who pays for sewer infrastructure, and how revenues generated will benefit the city and its citizens.

Members and Ms. Booker discussed the annexation request that was denied in relationship to the requested density. Council member Bridges discussed the fact that the area of proposed annexation was outside of the City and is one of the areas that the City is considering for ETJ. The developer had requested a higher density than what was currently inside our city. This would allow higher density on the outer fringe of our city than what is currently located within the City. This is not what Council wanted to do.

Ms. Booker discussed the proposed Land Use Plan and asked if it addressed the development density in this area. Council member Lambeth advised Ms. Booker that what the developer requested was a lot different than the zoning identified in the proposed Land Use Plan.

Council member Bridges asked what kind of things could be done by the City of Trinity to encourage development within our City Limits on vacant tracts of property. She discussed the vacant tracts of property located within the City and the need for economic development, and industrial and business development. It was her opinion that it was the intent of the City to complete in-fill development, not annexation of areas outside of the City Limits.

Manager Bailie agreed with Council member Bridges points. However, she asked Council to continue on the annexation topic for the benefit of the staff. We need to know how to respond when persons come to us. She discussed her feelings on the request for annexation when approached by the developers and advised Council it was her intent to try to figure out why the annexation failed and what Council's criteria was in order to consider annexation.

Council members and Manager Bailie discussed the density of the Land Use Plan. Manager Bailie asked Council what would happen if the area was inside the city limits, had the availability of sewer service, but the Land Use Plan dictated rural development. Which would prevail? Would our Land Use Plan prevail and Council would only allow (1) house per acre; or would Council consider that the infrastructure was in place so we will entertain the idea of allowing a more dense development and change the Land Use Plan to reflect the change.

Council member Lambeth advised Manager Bailie that this would be something that he would have to look at. If the proposed development was presented and appeared to be done nicely with open space and sports complex it may change my mind. That is why I feel strongly that the developer should provide detail to Council.

Ms. Booker reviewed the following conclusions concerning the denied annexation:

- 1. The challenge of the property being outside of the current city limits**
- 2. The proposed development was very dense, was permitted by the Zoning Ordinance, but not consistent with the Land Use Plan which the Council has not adopted at this time.**

Council members also discussed the affect this proposed development would have on the surrounding neighborhoods. It was the opinion of Council member Meredith the largest factor that addressed the failure of this request was jealousy from residents living inside the city limits concerning the fact that persons outside the area would receive sewer services before them as discussed earlier.

Council member Bridges stated that she heard more conversation concerning the quality of life issues. Council member Labonte discussed the one (1) telephone call he had received concerning the sewer issues as discussed earlier (providing service to an area outside the area before providing to a current area within the city). It was Council member Labonte's feelings that if the City annexed something and installed infrastructure that the City was not taking away from the people because the original plan will be when they will get sewer service. It was his opinion the City missed a good opportunity on this development. However, the presentation made on this proposal was not good and the time lines were not helpful. It was Council member Talbert's opinion that the high density was terrible.

Ms. Booker asked if high density development was inherently bad and it was her assumption that the annexation request that was denied apparently complied with the Zoning Ordinance. Ms. Booker and Mr. McNeill asked for clarification on the definition of high density.

Council member Bridges stated that this request did comply with the Zoning Ordinance and was not really high density when considered as an overall project. It was the way that the development was situated. Ms. Booker discussed how development had turned to cluster development with open space and green space. Council members commented on the developer's lack of providing a plan for Council to consider or to give a visual concept.

There was further discussion between Ms. Booker and Council members concerning information that would be helpful in the decision for annexation. It was the opinion that annexations should be strictly voluntary and no exceptions should be considered for sewer extensions except the school.

Manager Bailie asked for clarification on the topics discussed. She asked if Council members were suggesting that the City not provide sewer to any annexed areas. Council member Meredith discussed this with Manager Bailie and stated that the City should not provide sewer service to any voluntary annexed property. Council member Lambeth disagreed with Council member Meredith somewhat. He discussed the complaints that would be generated from citizens in regards to extending sewer services to some before others. It was his opinion that no matter if the service were extended inside or outside of the city the complaint from some citizens would be the same. He felt that the City would need to be able to negotiate at times when considering the extension of sewer services. If someone comes in with a detailed plan that illustrates an increase in revenues to the City we need to be able to consider the request.

Ms. Booker discussed the fundamental question that Council needed to decide as to whether staff forward a request for annexation to Council? Will it be Council's policy that you do not want to annex regardless of whether someone will provide sewer. If it is the Council's policy to consider the annexation if there is sewer and the proposed development is consistent with the Land Use Plan the staff will know to put the request on the Agenda for Council's consideration. The question is whether it is reasonable to put a request for annexation on the Agenda and what guidelines the staff will need to use.

Manager Bailie agreed with Ms. Booker and advised Council that she would like to get their input on:

1. If Council wished to entertain annexations at all.
2. Would Council be in agreement to annexation if the developer installs sewer.

Council member Talbert discussed the differences between the request for annexation proposed to go to Council and the request for annexation that Council denied. We are putting in a pump station for the school. Manager Bailie advised Council member Talbert that the City was not installing a pump station for the school. Council member Talbert stated the only thing that would need to be upgraded would be a larger pump for the pump station. The person requesting the annexation should pay. It should not be Trinity. It should not be one penny out of Trinity's treasury for this sewer. The upgrade to the sewer pump station and other costs associated will be cheaper than if he installed septic tanks.

It was Council member Labonte's opinion that one (1) item that hurt the first request was the fact that they asked to be rezoned and were not annexed into the City. We were approached to consider the zoning prior to the consideration of the annexation.

He discussed ETJ and how if implemented would prevent this type of situation from happening in the future. It was his opinion that ETJ should be considered very seriously and do part of it in the Archdale area as discussed.

If the ETJ is passed will it solve the problem that staff currently has?

Manager Bailie advised Council that it would solve the issue of dealing with zoning before the City has jurisdiction over the property in question. If we would have had ETJ in the area on the request that Council denied, we could have discussed at length their zoning request prior to any question of annexation. The question still remains if the City had ETJ, the area was outside of our city boundary, but the developer was willing to install sewer service, would Council consider the request.

It was Council member Labonte's opinion that every time the City denied a request the developer making the request will go elsewhere to develop. It was his opinion that Trinity should not say no to anyone at this time until they listened to what the proposal was. We should listen to everything that is brought to the City and pick what is best for the citizens of Trinity.

It was Council member Bridges opinion that the City could listen but set criteria on how they would like to see development in Trinity to take place.

Council member Labonte discussed the definition of density. He discussed his feelings on cluster homes with open space and used the example of cluster homes with 7 acres of open space with low density. It was his feeling that using this as low density was worded in a fashion that it was misleading. If you have 7 homes per acre, this is high density no matter how much open space is allotted.

Council member Lambeth discussed how some persons liked to live in dense development just as those of us who do not.

It was Council member Labonte's opinion that Council needed to keep an open mind concerning annexation.

Ms. Booker discussed with Council her summary of the discussion concerning this item which included the fact that as a process matter it makes a difference to have ETJ first so that City identified zoning is applied to the area. This will allow Council to discuss the current zoning for that area and whether or not they would like to change the zoning. She also felt there were differences of opinion from Council members as to whether they felt they should vote to annex an area regardless of the zoning if the developer provides services. This doesn't mean that staff needs to block that from coming to the Council because there may be some differences and others believe there are situations where the benefit of the developer provided sewer and the benefits to the City are rational and that staff should this type of item on the Agenda.

She discussed the request presented to Council and the lack of opportunity for Council to educate the public on the pros and cons of revenue and benefits to the city. Also, the fact that this property was not zoned by the city, did not give Council a chance to really consider the request.

Council member Labonte summarized his opinion that Council should entertain and look at any request that the City may receive for voluntary annexation.

Council member Talbert stated he felt the cost to the citizens should be clearly spelled out and information should be prepared that could be presented to a crowd so they would know what the proposal would be costing them.

The following items summarize the conversation concerning annexation and Council's desires.

➤ ***Council needs a fully detailed plan and information for the proposed annexation plan.***

➤ ***Public education so that both the Council and the Public understand the facts of the sewer***

extension and the revenues generated from these extensions.

- *As a process matter, it is better to have ETJ first, then zoning can be discussed*
- *Staff guidance: annex request can go on agenda*
- *Council will entertain and look at voluntary annexation*
- *Cost to citizens and Council clearly spelled out so it can be presented to citizens in a manner that will enable them to know what the costs for the project to the City would be*

School Site Voluntary Annexation

Manager Bailie opened this discussion by advising Council this would be a voluntary satellite annexation of approximately 565 acres. The developer has no plans to develop the property and has requested RA Zoning. There is a Special Use Permit request for approximately 125 acres of this property. Manager Bailie advised Council that there was considerable conversation taking place between Randolph County Schools and the property owner as whether or not to pull this annexation request and whether the school should go directly to the County to seek a Special Use Permit.

Manager Bailie asked for Council's thoughts and concerns. It was her opinion that this annexation was something that would be very positive for the City because of the future revenue stream. This project will not cost the City any monies. The person requesting the annexation is paying approximately \$6,000.00 in annexation fees, installing the sewer, and at some time in the future the property would be developed that would generate revenue from the tax base and sewer services to the City. The developer will agree to a 5 year period prior to any residential development of the property.

Mr. McNeill advised Council the school's schedule was to open the school in the fall of 2009. They will need to break ground and start construction in May. They can not acquire permits until they own the property.

Mr. McNeill and Attorney Wilhoit discussed with Council the results of the sludge report concerning this property. Attorney Wilhoit advised Council that if the report did not come back favorably the school would not be built on this site. Manager Bailie advised Council that she received information yesterday that all reports came back positive and everything was clear.

There was further discussion concerning Council's desire to pursue or deny this annexation request, and if they saw this as an opportunity that the City should take advantage of. Council members and Manager Bailie discussed what the costs would be and who would be responsible for the different costs including the proposed upgrades. Manager Bailie advised Council that the school would pay for all costs associated with their project. Attorney Wilhoit advised Council that the developer was contributing in excess of \$168,000.00 for the construction of the line and the upsizing of the pump station sizing in order to serve his property. Council member Talbert felt the information that the City will have no money in the project and the developer would be installing the infrastructure should be made available to the residents.

Manager Bailie advised Council that if the City agreed to the request for voluntarily annexation, they would provide the same service to this area as the city currently provides to its residents.

There was discussion between Mayor Andrews, Mr. McNeill and Council members concerning the size of the sewer pipes located along Finch Farm Road and their ability to accommodate a large restaurant or motel. Mr. McNeill advised Mayor Andrews and Council that there would be gravity sewer on the school site. The remainder of the line will consist of a pump line returning the sewer. There will not be any connections along this line until the gravity sewers are extended from the pump site. The pump station size is controlled by more than one (1) item. One important feature is how large the pipe size is that we connect to it. Because of the elevation difference and the engineering technology associated with this as well as the

availability of pumps, they will need to put in a large pump. The typical size that the school would install is a 4" line. However, that size line would not work without additional pump stations. Instead a larger line can be installed and pump the sewer one (1) time. By installing a larger line the pump must have enough capacity to keep the line clean. We will have ½ million GPD capacity with a 10,000 GPD usage. This means that we can serve everything that will happen in the drainage basin of that pump station.

Council members discussed the traffic currently on Finch Farm Road and whether or not the road would be widened.

After discussion, it was the general agreement of Council that the issue of road width and traffic be addressed.

Summary of this topic

- The school is paying for all sewer and pump station at \$0 costs to City
- 5 year moratorium on residential development
- Upfront presentation by developer on cost issues
- Provide context and full information to Council and residents
- Specific information: lanes on Finch Farm Road to address traffic

After further discussion, it was the general agreement that this annexation be considered with a 5 year moratorium placed on residential development on the remainder of the property not obtained by the school.

10:08- 10:29 Break

Evaluate Sewer Phases/ Implementation

Ms. Booker opened this item and turned discussion over the Manager Bailie to begin the review of the Sewer Phases.

Manager Bailie reviewed the handout (Paying for our Sewer System) incorporated below.

I. Financial Condition of Trinity re; Sewer Service

- A. Following construction of Sewer Phases 2-5; including debt to T-Ville
 1. \$2,126,420 annual debt payment
 2. \$1,326,420 annual debt payment after applying \$800,000 sales tax: revenue to debt (75% of total sales tax revenue).
 3. 33-cent tax increase; total tax rate: 43 cents
- B. Following construction of Sewer Phases 2-4; including debt to T-Ville
 1. \$1,665,580 annual debt payment
 2. \$ 865,558 annual debt payment after applying \$800,000 sales tax revenue to debt (75% of total sales tax revenue).
 3. 22-cent tax increase; total tax rate: 32 cents
- C. Following construction of Sewer Phases 2-3; including debt to T-Ville
 1. \$1,247,588 annual debt payment
 2. \$ 447,588 annual debt payment after applying \$800,000 sales tax revenue to debt (75% of total sales tax revenue).
 3. 11-cent tax increase; total tax rate: 21 cents

- D. Following construction of Sewer Phase 2; including debt to T-Ville
 - 1. \$ 500,000 annual debt payment
 - 2. \$ 0.00 annual debt payment after applying \$800,000 sales tax revenue to debt (75% of total sales tax revenue).
 - 3. No tax increase; total tax rate: 10 cents

II. Three Choices for Paying for Sewer System Expansion

- A. Increase taxes
- B. Reduce planned sewer system expansion
- C. Encourage quality growth to pay for sewer system expansion
 - 1. Each residential sewer customer generates approximately \$275 annual payment toward debt reduction; commercial and industrial customers generate more than residential customers.
 - 2. Trinity currently has 232 customers. Customers in the pipeline:
 - a. 65 Colonial Heights
 - b. 66 Darr Rd.
 - c. 260 Phase 2
 - d. 355 Phase 3
 - e. 319 Phase 4
 - f. 203 Phase 5
 - g. TOTAL: 1,268 Plus 232 existing customers
 - h. GRAND TOTAL: 1,500 customers upon completion of the identified sewer projects phases
 - 3. Trinity currently has about 2,700 households. It will take approximately 5,000 customers to pay the annual debt for all five phases and the WWTP (while using 85% of the reserved capacity in the WWTP)
 - 4. 1,800 customers would produce enough revenue to pay the \$500,000 annual debt to Thomasville (while using 30% of the reserved capacity in the WWTP.)

III. General Financial Information

- A. Trinity receives more revenue from population-based tax distribution rather than from property tax collections.
 - 1. Unlike most cities, Trinity receives most of its revenue from sales tax (rather than property taxes) which is currently distributed on the basis of population (each year the County has the option of changing the basis of distribution from population to the amount of

property tax levied). Trinity receives approximately \$155/person/year.

- a. Revenue Example: (Assumption: 500 homes with 2.5 persons per home; Average home value: \$200,000.)
 - i. Annual Sales Tax revenue: \$193,750 (equivalent to 5-cent tax increase)
 - ii. Annual Property Tax revenue (\$. 10 tax rate): \$100,000 (equivalent to 2.6-cent tax increase)
2. Powell Bill funds are distributed on a formula that includes population (\$22.62/person) and miles of city-owned roads (\$1,685.56/mile). Trinity receives most of its Powell Bill revenue based on the population factor.

B. City Utilities Policy/Fee Schedule

1. Sewer rates and capacity fees for customers outside the City limit: are twice as much as those for City residents.
 - a. This rate schedule was adopted by the City Council in Dec 2005. The Utilities Committee, in recommending this fee structure stated, that double rates were appropriate because it would encourage voluntary annexation and strengthen Trinity's tax base.
 - b. The recommendation also noted that outside customers would be using capacity that would otherwise be reserved for City residents.

After Manager Bailie's review, she turned the discussion over to Mr. McNeill, City Engineer. Mr. McNeill discussed the review advising Council the information provided was realistic however it did not include any growth.

Mr. McNeill began his discussion with the planned sewer to the schools. Mr. McNeill discussed with Council an exhibit that marked the proposed school site on the property discussed earlier. He also discussed the location of the sewer force main that will pump the sewer from the lowest part on the school site in order to serve the new High School, a future Middle School, football stadium and some soccer fields. We will pump back to existing sewer lines located on the east side of Finch Farm Road across from the main entrance to the Steeplegate community. No gravity connections can be made to the force main and no homes along this line will be able to connect to it. Other systems could pump into this line at some point in the future. The school will use less than 10,000 GPD. They will pay a consumption charge monthly that will be based on the amount of water that flows through their meter into the school site. Mr. McNeill discussed with Council the methodology used to determine the capacity fee due from the school. For a school the formula will be $3 \times 15,000 = \$45,000.00$ one time capacity fee due from the school, if the school is within the City limits. This capacity fee will help in offsetting the debt payment of the City. If the city decides there are some upsize costs that that need to be made in the future you may decide to let the school absorb these costs or you could contribute a portion of your capacity fees toward the upgrades. Our firm

does not recommend that the City waive fees for any applicant. We strongly recommend that capacity fees be charged by the City.

Mr. McNeill discussed the southeast area of the city and conversations that had taken place with the City of Archdale. He described the lines illustrated on the exhibit and how they illustrated the drainage basin in areas where if sewer were installed they would flow down hill towards a treatment plant or pump station for future use. Mr. McNeill discussed with Council that the ideal location site for a sewer treatment plant in the area of the Uwharrie River.

Mr. McNeill discussed the network of pump stations being installed that included a pump station in Phase 1 that pumps to the City of Thomasville. He also discussed possible future systems for the City and how the sewer would pump. The following points were made during this review with the following options:

- 4 to 5 million GPD per day (future) install ultimate force mains and pump stations and continue to pump all wastewater to the City of Thomasville.
- Continue to send Phase 1 and 2 to Thomasville and turn everything else to gravity and send to the proposed treatment plant, and eliminate the pump stations that are being installed. The ultimate solution is a savings of 25 million to have a treatment plant at Uwharrie.
- Long term financial advantage to have a regional treatment plant with the City of Archdale at this location.

Mr. McNeill discussed some of the difficulties in achieving this for the future. The City of Trinity and the City of Archdale are both already members of regional treatment plant and may raise issues with the State of North Carolina in issuing a permit for yet another regional treatment plant. It was Mr. McNeill's opinion that justification to the state could be made based on what both municipalities are trying to accomplish.

Mr. McNeill discussed the ideas that had been presented concerning this effort by the City of Archdale that included an interim pump station that could be done separately or together at Fairview Church Road. This pump station would be used to service anything coming from Archdale Road, Robbins Country Road, and would also allow gravity sewer for Trinity's Fairview Church Road Sub-basin. It was Mr. McNeill's opinion this was a good idea, however, there would be a lot of details that would need to be worked out on this proposal.

Mr. McNeill advised Council that an environmental consultant was going to be called in to discuss with the staff of both city's when this project needs to get started and the length of time that a project such as this will take to complete. All of these factors become important when Council begins talking about establishing an ETJ. The City of Archdale already has an established ETJ and some of the property located in their ETJ will have to flow by gravity through Trinity to get to Archdale.

There was further discussion between Mr. McNeill, Council members, and Manager Bailie how this joint plant would play into the ETJ and discussion about where the service areas for each city will be located as well as an annexation service agreement between the two (2) city's.

Council members and Attorney Wilhoit discussed if a resident requesting annexation could choose what City they wished to annex their property. Attorney Wilhoit advised Council that if the citizen were close to both boundary lines usually can not request or dictate annexation without an agreement between the two (2) cities. Municipalities that are close usually have an annexation agreement. An ETJ does not automatically extend boundary lines when annexation occurs. A municipality must go through all the steps to extend its city limits.

At this time, Mr. McNeill updated Council on the following projects:

Darr Rd: This project is approximately 80% to 90 % complete. The contractor is installing the lines on Gray Oaks and Libby Roads. The contractor needs to get balance of sewer installed and turn the pump

station on. The contractor will need to stub out the services and make the sewer connections to qualified applicants according to the specifications of the CDBG Grant. To get the homes connected could take approximately 2 months for total completion of this project.

Phase 2: This project is just getting underway. The contractor has been working in the Dawnwood Mobile Home Park area. He currently has 2 crews in this area and will be introducing another crew into this area as well as another crew to begin work on the outfall lines.

Phase 1: We are getting ready to make the final Grant Reimbursement Request for this project of approximately \$150,000.00. We will spend approximately 2.8 million dollars of the 3 million awarded in this Grant.

Cost Analysis Summary (Attachment A)

Mr. McNeill discussed the cost analysis summary included in the Retreat Package. He discussed the direction given by Council to his firm to create new phases and their efforts to work with Council and the Infrastructure Committee to determine the areas that could be served for the least cost per customer. As shown by this analysis the cost per user illustrates the costs to develop sewer in the different areas listed and indicates the expense involved.

Mr. McNeill discussed the possibility of trimming costs on some of the projects as the City moved forward. It was his opinion that Phase 3 was a good investment. This phase has met 2 of the goals set by Council to serve the residential neighborhoods and to try to use the funding source that serves neighborhoods to provide sewer service to economic growth areas. The Phase 3 Jerry Street area also includes a pump station as well as gravity sewer to make all of this happen. This Phase is being used to put in the infrastructure for future commercial growth along Surrent Drive. One of the first charges we were given during the feasibility study was to show the City how they could complete economical projects that would also provide sewer service to the Interstate corridor. When we began to pursue USDA Rural Development Funding we had to use the same idea but had to serve neighborhoods in order to receive funding from this agency.

Mr. McNeill discussed his letter to Mr. Allen Hart, USDA Rural Representative. This letter discussed the 5 million dollars offered to help pay for the 7.2 million dollar original project that we now feel cost 10 million to complete. The economic factor for the past 2 to 3 years have been devastating on the cost of utilities. We discussed with Mr. Hart the possibility of receiving additional funding for this project. We started and finished our design in the Lakewood Area and have this portion of the project submitted for permits. We are beginning to take steps in the other areas of this project. The surveying is complete except for a few locations that we need to do relocations due to movement of the water line by Davidson Water. The last page of the letter dated January 26, 2007 (**Attachment B**) shows the 10 million dollar costs. Also defined in the letter are 3 potential construction projects. Our funding agency has advised us that they want the City to acquire all easements prior to undertaking the loan project they have offered. This means the City will have to wait until all easements are acquired (approximately 300) or the City can fund some of this work with their local share. This will allow construction to begin early.

Mr. McNeill recommended that the City stay on task with Phase 3 as planned and try to get more federal funding into the project. Our initial plan was to complete Phases 2 through 5 with 25% local money, the cost of taps that will be installed and the remainder be paid by bond referendum dollars. Without some in-growth and additional growth the City will have funding problems when it reaches Phase 5 since we will not be generating enough revenue to continue without a tax increase.

There was discussion between Mr. McNeill and Council members concerning the projection date of Phase 5. Mr. McNeill advised Council this Phase needed to start by 2009 or 2010 since the Bond Monies must be expended by 2014. There was further discussion concerning the request that was discussed earlier. Mr. McNeill advised Council that originally the City presented a 7.2 million dollar project for Phase 3 and we were offered 5 million of the bond monies by the funding agency. We are asking them to reconsider their offer and offer us additional funding to help finance Phase 3 from the original 15 million dollar bond referendum. This will give us better financing opportunities since their rate is a good market rate on the interest as well as extends the repayment terms for 40 years. The City can not get more than 15 million dollars from the funding agency without another bond referendum.

Manager Bailie and Mr. McNeill discussed what items were included in the analysis presented to Council on ways to fund the Phases. Manager Bailie discussed the tap fee revenue as well as the maintenance cost involved with the infrastructure. These are not factored into the analysis. However, as an overall picture these items will be a wash out and probably not significant in the total scheme of the projects.

Mr. McNeill discussed the advantages of delaying the Phase 5 project as long as the City stayed within the date of 2014 for bond purposes. This will allow the City to continue to add to their funds with sales tax dollars that can be used to apply toward the project costs. The City can pursue borrowing additional funds or delay the project and accumulate these funds to help off set the costs of this Phase.

Manager Bailie discussed the handout given to Council (Attachment C) at the Retreat that showed the amount of bond dollars and city dollars allocated to each Phase as they currently are allocated. If the City is successful in obtaining additional funding for Phase 3 it would change the city allocation of funding for this Phase but would increase the city allocation in another Phase since the allocation of bond dollars would decrease in the other Phases. The total allocation of City funds for Phases 2-5 is 11 million dollars. This is in addition to the 15 million dollar bond monies.

Mr. McNeill discussed the treatment plant costs and what affect these costs had on these projects. The cost is not quite 200% higher than what was expected. The cost overrun on the treatment plant has made a considerable difference in the analysis of costs to be incurred by the City. Manager Bailie advised members that when the treatment costs were included with the costs of the 5 Phases the total costs to be incurred by the City was 21 million dollars.

Mr. McNeill continued with his review discussing Phase 4. This has been split into Phases 4A, 4B, 4C, and 4D. He discussed the possibility of changing the scope of this Phase but advised Council that the funding agency would have to agree since the City would not be serving every customer that we planned to serve initially. However there may be a cost benefit ratio to not extend the sewer to every parcel of land as we had planned to do in the beginning. He discussed the ranges of these breakdowns as well as the number of customers that would be included for each section in Phase 4. He advised Council that there were some areas included in these breakdowns that could be eliminated when costs were refined and this project was underway. If the City proceeds with Phase 3 and 4 as planned, Phase 5 will have to be financed in a different manner or the scope of the Phase 5 project will need to be decreased.

Mr. McNeill discussed how Grant dollars had been awarded to fund the Phase 1 project with monies that were awarded from the State Bond Referendum funds as well as some additional grant funding for Phase 2, and the CDBG Project that required contribution from the City. He discussed the 2 bills proposed for 1 billion dollars in water and sewer bonds that did not clear the committee. We will continue searching for other funding sources that may be available. He discussed the State and Tribal Assistance Grants that were awarded to each Federal Senator and House Member to spend in his district as they so choose. The problem with this funding source is the drastic cuts expected for this type of funding. The name of this funding source has been changed and will now require that these persons be more selective in how these funds are awarded. It will require a worthwhile project with more support data. It was Mr. McNeill's opinion that it would be beneficial to the City to request some of this congressional money for the Phase 3 project. He discussed the need to define how much money the City should request.

Mr. McNeill advised Council it was his opinion the best funding source available at this time was Job Creation Grants in conjunction with economic development. This funding source requires that a business create jobs in order to obtain funds to extend infrastructure. Community Development Funding as the City used in the Darr Road area is getting smaller. There may be a small portion of Phase 3 that was a portion of the Dawnwood Mobile Home Park that was separated when the Interstate was built that may qualify for this type of funding. We will need to acquire the assistance of Benchmark to help us evaluate this area for funding with CDBG funds. The City loan dollars would represent the match for the project.

It was Mr. McNeill's opinion that if the City remained on the course that was plotted and in-growth occurred in the communities, the revenues would increase and would help offset some of the costs involved in these projects. It will be difficult to pay for all of these phases with the dedicated Sales Tax revenue and no tax rate increase at some point. Council will need to evaluate how much they are willing to decrease the

City Fund Balance. The finance director will need to evaluate the scope of taking money from the fund balance in comparison to using loan dollars and the repayment costs of using borrowed monies. The Council will need to take this information and decide whether to borrow money or use existing funds to subsidize these projects.

Mr. McNeill continued his discussion concerning Phase 5. Mr. McNeill discussed the 3 options that he had presented for Phase 5.

1. To continue as planned at a cost of \$6,950,000.00
2. Work out an agreement with Archdale concerning a treatment plant. The City would start the process of installing 8, 12, 18, and 24 inch lines and pump the same route along the Uwharrie River through a 36inch line. This would be large enough to get all of the flow north of the Interstate to the Treatment Plant in the future. This would increase the costs from 6.9 million to 9 million.
3. The original scope of this project included a pump station set at the City Limit line to serve Phase 5 as planned and all areas between Fairview Church Road, Coltrane Street, and Meadowbrook, to the City Limit line could be served by this pump station. If we move the location of the pump station uphill to serve just a smaller area the 6.9 million drops to 4.6 million dollars. There is a way to reduce the scope of Phase 5 if financing becomes more difficult. If we do not get an agreement worked out with Archdale before 2014, this area could be refined to include a small area to be served by a temporary pump station. Then if an agreement is worked out with Archdale piping will not need to be replaced. If this is delayed the City will not be able to serve some of the residents defined in this Phase that is west of Meadowbrook, between Wagner Road and Coltrane Street. This is a significant potential change to the scope of this project. It was the opinion of Mr. McNeill that if the City reached this point that the funding agency would not have a problem with the scope of this Phase being reduced to eliminate a few homes and decreasing the costs of this project 2 million dollars.

Mr. McNeill discussed the reasons for request of annexation into the City. Until the City began installing sewer this was not a viable option. It was his opinion that once sewer was made available through the Phase 3 project more requests would come to the City for development especially in the Surret Drive area. He discussed the need to get sewer to the City Hall property located in Phase 4A. This area would give sewer services to the City property as well as service to all of the schools except Hopewell School which will be included in the Phase 3 project. This will give the City an increase of customers at once. There may be some advantage to construction Phase 4A as soon as Phase 3 is completed. We may produce some financial evaluations to Council along with options to complete this area ahead of the other Phase 4 areas since this will create an increased customer base for the City.

The City Manager and I wanted to make sure that Council understands costs have increased and that we based our analysis on growth. We will need to re-evaluate our growth potentials. I included in-growth, the subdivisions that are currently underway, a subdivision that was submitted in the preliminary stages next to Colonial Heights, and a commercial area along NC Highway 62, included in the Phase 3 number analysis. We did not include the Hopewell area or the school since we were not aware of the potential development of these areas.

Mr. McNeill discussed with Council their feelings on consideration of Phase 4 and eliminating Phase 5. If we could tie this together we could possibly tie into a PARTF Grant that would help fund placement of a City Park on the City property, help extend sewer to City Property and use Powell Bill money to help extend a road into the City Property. The City would have to pay a dollar for dollar match on PARTF funding. The City match could be the sewer that you would install and the Powell Bill monies that would be used for the road. That would mean that the Grant would pay for 100% of the Park.

Until Phase 3 is further along in its process, this will give you some things to consider. We will be coming back to Council with a proposal for an increase to our funding agency and your input on our ideas concerning the best way to approach Phase 3 to include additional funding.

There was discussion between Mr. McNeill and Council members concerning how the funding agency would distribute funding and the need to acquire all easements for the complete Phase prior to beginning the project. Mr. McNeill advised members that the City could proceed with any section of this Phase as long as they were using city funding without all easements, however, any portion that would require bond monies would require easements be complete. We could possibly construct the Phase 4A along with Phase 3. It would increase the overall costs to approximately 8 million. The funding agency may increase the offer to 7million dollars but staff will need to consider what this would mean in dollars. What will the payments be on a 5 million dollar loan verses a 7 million dollar loan, and how the cash flow is handled to make all of this happen.

Manager Bailie asked if the City proceeded as planned with Phase 3, what date was projected for beginning Phase 4. We would need to know the date in order to consider a PARTF Grant.

Mr. McNeill advised members that Phase 4 projects could begin as early as the fall. Manager Bailie discussed a meeting held by the Building Committee last summer and the discussion that took place concerning the design for a City Hall and the possibility of applying for a PARTF Grant. The City can use expenses prior to the application as part of the match. We need to time this so that when the City applies for a PARTF Grant we will want to have completed the planning for the property in the preceding year. We discussed applying in January 2008. If this is still the date that we want to keep we will need to start planning for it this year. If the sewer in this area is going to be pushed back for a year we will not begin this process this year.

Mr. McNeill advised Manager Bailie that if the application were filed the City would not know if they had been approved for their request until the middle of the next year, 2008. From the time of notification of acceptance the City will have 24 months to construct the project. If we apply for a PARTF Grant in 2008, it may be 2011 before the PARTF Grant is awarded.

Manager Bailie stated that she wanted to make sure that the money that was expended for a master plan could be used as a part of the match required by this grant. When would sewer be available to the property.

Mr. McNeill stated that he felt the application should take place in January 2008. Then if we are notified in the middle of 2008 that the City application was approved, we would start the park design. By the time that was completed in 2010, Phase 3 could b finished and Phase 4A could be coordinated to be complete as well.

After further discussion, Mr. McNeill and Manager Bailie will work on this area to determine the date that application for PARTF needed to be made.

There was discussion between members and Mr. McNeill concerning any other areas that Council may want to focus on for sewer installation. Council member Meredith felt that any places where grants may be available should be considered.

Mr. McNeill discussed the importance in getting the developers to understand the proposed plan and how this could be beneficial to the City. He discussed the possibility of obtaining funds for infrastructure for job creation in connection to the scenario of the development of a strip mall. If this occurred and the employers in this location were willing to meet the funding requirements of such a grant this would be beneficial to all parties.

At the conclusion of his review, Mr. McNeill advised Council that the sewer phases were a building base for potential growth and that it would be very economical to serve anything in the vicinity of the sewer infrastructure.

At this time Ms. Booker called for questions, actions, or further discussion on this topic.

Council member Meredith felt that the City of Trinity needed to pursue discussion with the City of Archdale as soon as possible. Manager Bailie advised members that discussion was ongoing with Archdale and that she and Mr. McNeill had conversations with the staff on more than one (1) occasion.

Council member Reddick discussed the recent tax increase implemented by the City and stated that she did not want to increase taxes again if there was other options.

Council member Labonte stated that the City should apply for any Grant funding that may be available. This funding needs to be pursued.

Attorney Wilhoit discussed the possibility of participation for Clean Water Grants. Mr. McNeill discussed the Rural Center's role in this funding. This is a non-profit agency that spearheads this type of effort. They paid for all of the planning to prove to the legislatures that there is a need for this type of funding. The need in North Carolina for infrastructure is approximately 13 billion dollars. They will pursue this to make this funding available.

After further discussion between Mr. McNeill, Council members, Manager Bailie, and Ms. Booker concerning possible funding sources to help pay for the proposed projects, how combining Phase 4A with Phase 3 may be beneficial to the City by generating additional revenues as well as other potential ways to generate revenue the **following direction list for Mr. McNeill and staff was generated.**

- *Control discussion with Archdale.*
- *Evaluate providing gravity sewer to schools as soon as possible.*
- *Mr. McNeill prepares and presents to Council an update to include 4A with the Phase 3 project.*
- *Update revenues generated that would include Phase 4A since the schools will be added and customer base increased.*
- *Pursue any areas that may qualify for possible CDBG funding such as Jerry Street within the Phases*
- *Sewer projects may need to be slowed down but at this point no deletion to the current Phases.*
- *Make sure that all projects are completed on time.*

Building Materials

Ms. Booker opened this item and discussed the handouts given to Council from neighboring municipalities. She discussed the handout that referenced the City of Asheboro and some exterior building standards that they had incorporated into their Zoning Ordinance. These are stricter for commercial areas with stricter standards industrial areas if they are located 200 feet from the roadway.

The next review was from a handout concerning the City of Archdale and their building standards. These are similar to the standards that you looked at in your draft Thoroughfare Plan.

All municipalities have a similar theme and that is control or minimal use of sheet or corrugated aluminum, plain or concrete block, exterior panel of plywood. The standards were developed to reduce the use of these types of materials if it is visible from roadways or if it is in a commercial area. The City of Asheboro has incorporated these standards into the Zoning Ordinance. Other cities choose to apply these standards in a particular Thoroughfare Overlay District. The building materials have a similar theme.

Council member Bridges discussed the Thoroughfare Overlay Draft that was denied and the fact that some members wanted the standards incorporated into the zoning., however, when presented as changes to be incorporated into our zoning that was denied as well.

There was discussion between Ms. Booker, Council members, and Attorney Wilhoit concerning their purpose for wanting to discuss this issue. Council members discussed the comments made by citizens concerning their desire for setting high standards for development inside the City, the restrictiveness of the proposed standards, and the need to be consistent so the developers will know what the City expects.

After further discussion of Asheboro's design standards that applied in commercial and industrial, the guidelines and consistency included in their document the following general agreement and consensus was reached.

- *Council members will take the design standards used by the City of Asheboro home and bring back to the February Pre-Agenda with incorporated questions and changes for staff.*
- *Mr. Stumb to call the Planning Department to gather information concerning Asheboro's experiences with this incorporation into their zoning and report to Council his findings.*
- *After Council's review, send the proposed changes back to the Planning Board for their review and input. If incorporated into your Ordinance new legislation will require that a written recommendation be made by the Planning Board and their reasons for approval of denial.*

Recessed by Mayor Andrews at 12:11 for lunch.

Mayor Andrews called the Annual Retreat back to order at 1:16 p.m.

After the meeting resumed Ms. Booker opened the next item and called for input from the Finance Officer. Ms. Hinson reviewed the financial summary statement summaries for each fund highlighting notes attached with each.

Financial Statements

After the meeting resumed Ms. Booker opened the next item and called for input from the Finance Officer. Ms. Hinson reviewed the financial summary statement summaries for each fund highlighting notes attached with each. (Attachment D Summary Sheets)

After Ms. Hinson's review Council member Meredith asked how much the City had dedicated for funding towards a new City Hall. Manager Bailie advised Council that \$50,000.00 had been set aside for this fiscal year only. There was discussion among members and Manager Bailie concerning any amount that may have been set aside in the prior year budget. Manager Bailie advised Council members that Council discussed this but did not actually set aside an amount in last year's budget. If Council would like to add to the amount we could accomplish this by taking money from the General Fund any time during the year by budget amendment or budget for an additional amount in the new fiscal year budget. Also discussed was the budget item concerning hydrants. Mr. McNeill advised Council this was for new hydrants that would be moved or added during the construction of the new 16" water line by Davidson County. Our firm evaluated their plans when installation started on this line and budgeted some money in the event that we asked them to add additional hydrants. Manager Bailie advised Council that if the hydrants had been installed the City had not been billed to date.

There was discussion concerning the salary line item listed in both administration and planning as well as what expenditures constituted the line item of professional services in the planning department. Manager Bailie advised members that Mr. Stumb was listed in the planning department and the professional service line item was budgeted to pay any fees due to Attorney Wilhoit, as well as Anderson and Associates for engineering services. The mailing fees for postage for planning items are listed in the administration department. Professional services in the Powell Bill funds consist of expenditures to Davis, Martin, and Powell Associates for related Powell Bill Map and any other eligible engineering or other service that is eligible for Powell Bill expenditures.

With no further discussion, Ms. Booker continued to the next Agenda Item.

Safety Committee

Ms. Booker opened this item by advising members that the issue for this item was to create a Safety Committee and what issues this Committee might oversee. At this time Ms. Booker turned the discussion over to Manager Bailie.

Manager Bailie reviewed how the idea for this Committee came about during the review of the City Ordinances prior to their codification. The City had not adopted an Ordinance that specified a Safety Committee. In reviewing the Ordinances prior to mailing them for Codification we discussed about the Safety Committee that should exist by Ordinance. At that time Council decided to remove this entire section and not forward it to be codified. The discussion at that time was to consider forming a Safety Committee. Council member Reddick volunteered to gather some information which she did. Manager Bailie discussed the draft handout (below) she passed out that discussed the duties and responsibilities that this Committee might have. There was further discussion concerning this item at a Pre-Agenda Meeting and at that time it was decided to table this item for further consideration and discussion until this Retreat.

Trinity Public Safety Board

Type of Board: Standing Advisory Board to City Council

Mission Statement: The Trinity Public Safety Board and its individual members are dedicated to promoting the health, safety and welfare of City residents and creating a safe work environment for City employees.

General Duties and Responsibilities:

- Identify public safety issues and develop recommendations for mitigation.
- Develop, promote and organize safety and wellness programs and services for City residents;
- Provide a safe and healthy work environment for City employees

Specific Duties and Responsibilities:

- Develop a disaster preparedness plan for City government and community residents and businesses.
- Enhance communication and promote cooperation between Fair Grove and Guil-Rand fire departments and periodically evaluate services;
- Oversee law enforcement per agreement between the City of Trinity and Randolph County's Sheriffs Department.
- Oversee animal control per agreement between cities of Trinity and Archdale.
- Develop an annual community wellness campaign for residents featuring such activities as blood pressure checks, smoking cessation and prevention, child safety seat and seat belt usage, water safety, bike safety and abuse prevention (alcohol/substance, domestic, sexual, animal, school bullying).

General Provisions

The Trinity Public Safety Board will operate with minimal City Staff support. One member shall be chosen as secretary to take and transcribe minutes of the meetings and submit them to the City Clerk in a form acceptable to the City.

The Board shall fulfill its duties and responsibilities only after program and/or implementation plans have been approved by the City Council.

Compliance with Trinity Code of Ordinances

Provisions of Trinity Code of Ordinances Chapter 31 shall be applicable to the Trinity Public Safety Board except for Section 31.02 Membership.

Membership of the Trinity Public Safety Board shall consist of individuals with demonstrated expertise in public safety except for one member appointed as secretary. Neither ward representation nor City residency shall be criteria for membership. The Board shall consist of no more than nine (9) members.

At this time, Ms. Booker advised Council the next step was to discuss the information provided, ask questions and clarify any concerns that they may have and decide on the next steps. The Manager had created a draft proposal for creating a committee, it's function, the kind of people that might make up the committee, and then some background information from Randolph County.

Manager Bailie discussed the information provided concerning Randolph County. Approximately 2 years ago Randolph County adopted the National Incident Management System and the City of Trinity by Ordinance agreed to participate in this. It does involve different levels of training for elected officials as well as city staff. It is not mandatory but is something that the City should probably do.

Council member Meredith discussed the second bullet listed under General Duties and Responsibilities and the 2nd sentence in the last paragraph discussing ward representation.

Manager Bailie advised Council that the information being discussed was only a draft and that Council needed to decide if this was something that they would like to do and did the City need this type of committee.

Council member Bridges discussed prior meetings and discussions concerning this item. It was her interpretation of those discussions that the 2nd bullet listed under the General Duties, the last bullet listed under the Specific Duties and the sentence concerning Ward representation referenced by Council member Meredith earlier were the items that some Council members objected to in earlier discussion of this item. Council member Bridges stated that she had no objections to removing these items but felt that the City did need to form a Safety Committee.

There was discussion among members concerning the last bullet item listed under the Specific Duties and Responsibilities and whether or not this item should be included. Manager Bailie advised members this item was listed in an effort to hold a public wellness fair once per year. It was Council member Talbert's opinion that this item did not need to be a part of the draft since some of the items were covered by other institutions. Manager Bailie advised Council that the intent of this bullet was not developed in order for the City to proactively address these problems. The intent was to hold an annual health and wellness fair where different representatives attend from different organizations and offer these services to our citizens. Council member Lambeth discussed his experience with this type of function through his church that was offered to the citizens. Mayor Andrews discussed some of the items that could be removed from this bullet specifically the items listed under abuse prevention. It was Council member Ewings opinion that the City should look at the child safety seat and seat belt usage. Mayor Andrews discussed the benefits to the elderly that could be offered by offering the blood pressure checks, diabetic testing, and hearing tests. Council member Meredith stated that he had no problem with this as a concept, however he felt that if this committee would be a recommending body there should not be anyone allowed to serve on the committee that lived outside of the City of Trinity. Council member Lambeth discussed the disadvantage of not allowing others to serve on the committee that may not live in the City but may be well trained in chemical disaster. Council member Bridges discussed the volunteers that used City Hall for their Ham Radio Training. There may be someone participating in this organization that would like to serve on this committee. Council member Talbert discussed the need to make sure that the fire departments were well trained in handling the chemical spills that may prove a threat to the City or its citizens.

After further discussion between Council members and the need to develop some type of Safety Committee the following items represent the general agreement of Council.

- ***It is o.k. to have a non-resident on the board (make no changes to the 2nd sentence in the last paragraph)***
- ***Keep the last bullet item listed under Specific Duties but stop this paragraph after bike safety and delete all items related to abuse.***
- ***Develop a Mutual Aid Agreement with the Red Cross that will allow the Red Cross to partner with the City to teach the need for preparedness for a natural disaster as well as how to handle a disaster.***
- ***Make changes and add this item to the February Council Agenda.***

Animal Control

Manager Bailie discussed the animal control statistics prepared by Mayor Andrews. The City does not receive descriptive reports concerning what services are provided by our Animal Control officer. Manager Bailie felt that if the Safety Committee was formed this would be a project for them. They would be charged with analyzing the activities of our Animal Control Officer.

There was discussion between Council members, Mayor Andrews, and Manager Bailie concerning the locations listed on the report, the number of times that the animal control officer had gone to the addresses, and the services provided during the call.

Manager Bailie discussed the problems that she had incurred that included not receiving regular reports, the limited time that she had available to review and stay abreast of the reports that she did receive, as well as no time available for staff to complete reviews. It was her opinion the City did not have sufficient oversight in this area and this is something that the Safety Committee could review.

Manager Bailie and Council members discussed the amount of dollars budgeted for this service. Manager Bailie advised Council members the cost was approximately \$32,000.00 annually or 60% of the total animal control budget presented.

Mayor Andrews and Council discussed the possibility of charging fees for dogs running at large and how the City might wish to review this for future use inside Trinity for repeat offenders.

After further discussion, it was the general agreement that this item be turned over to the Safety Committee once formed. That the committee review and make recommendations to Council to include a detail report for services performed inside Trinity such as the number of animals picked up, any abuse that may have occurred, and any other recommendations that they feel may need to be addressed, as well as the possibility of charging a fee to repeat offenders.

Stormwater

Ms. Booker called on Ms. Schreiber, Projects Coordinator to review this item with Council.

Ms. Schreiber reviewed the handout provided to Council (Attachment) highlighting the following areas:

- **Stormwater Permit was issued to the City of Trinity in October 2004. We have had various BMP requirements that are illustrated in the NPDES Phase II Permit BMP Components and consist of Public Education and Outreach that we began satisfying in 2005-2006. We became involved with the Piedmont Triad Regional Water Quality Partnership for public involvement. This was completed last year and we are involved with their Carolina Yards and Neighborhoods Program. This handles most of the public involvement and participation.**
- **The City has some permit requirements coming up for illicit discharge detection and elimination, construction site run-off controls that need to be satisfied.**
- **That the City discusses costs of the Stormwater Program as shown on page 7 of the power point presentation. The total costs of contracting out this service verses the in house costs is illustrated in the chart. It illustrates that the costs for years 1, 2, and 3 are the same, but because of the illicit discharge program years 4 and 5 the prices are increased dramatically as shown.**

After Ms. Schreiber's review, Manager Bailie advised Council members that this was an unfunded mandate that the City must comply with and decide how they will pay for the costs incurred. She discussed the

handout provided to Council from the Triangle J Council of Governments (**Attachment F**) concerning stormwater fees. This will give you an idea of fees charged by other municipalities to pay for their program.

Manager Bailie asked Council for direction on how they would like for staff to proceed with this item and discussed some of the obstacles that the City faced since we had no billing department. She asked Council if it was their desire for staff to look into setting fees and figure out how to fund or did they prefer to budget and pay for this program through general fund dollars.

Council member discussed options that included the possibility of these fees being billed by the County as a part of the annual tax bill. Also discussed was the time frame for implementation of this fee. Manager Bailie advised Council members the City was in year 2 of a 5 year program. The state approved a program that the City submitted to them and issued our permit based on this plan.

Manager Bailie discussed with Council members the different options that were used by other municipalities when implementation fees were first incurred that included a flat fee basis that was added to the regular monthly utility billing. Manager Bailie and Council members discussed the differences that were shown in the handout concerning the flat fee method and the difference in the rates charged for residential versus flat fee rates charged for commercial. This fee is charged to all property owners inside the municipal area including churches. No property is exempt.

After further discussion the following general agreement was reached by Council members concerning this item.

- *Staff to pursue discussion with the County and other entities concerning the possibility of billing and collection of fees.*
- *This fee be based on the Flat Fee Basis and staff to pursue discussion with other municipalities*

Yard Waste/Recycling Opportunity

Council member Lambeth discussed his conversations with a vendor that may provide services to help City to provide a means of disposal of yard waste. Council member Lambeth reviewed his earlier discussion with this vendor advising Council that he plans to put in a mulch yard. It was his idea that this would help the City provide a means of disposal of yard waste beginning with smaller sizes with the possibility of adding larger items in the future with the addition of a tub grinder. Mr. Lambeth discussed how this would benefit the residents of Trinity.

Mr. Lambeth also discussed the possibility of putting in a manned recycling site at this area and would be located just outside of the City Limits of Trinity. This site would be manned during the day and closed and gated during the night time hours.

After further discussion between Council members, Mayor Andrews, and Manager Bailie, **the following general agreement was reached by Council.**

- *Manager Bailie and Council member Lambeth pursue the possibility of providing a mulch yard as discussed*
- *Manager Bailie to discuss and invite the County's participation concerning the addition to a manned recycling site at this location in the future.*

LAND USE PLAN

Ms. Booker opened this item and turned discussion over to Manager Bailie.

Manager Bailie advised Council that she had incorporated the changes and revisions to this plan as discussed earlier in the week that included the removal of names as discussed, removal of some of the density requirements, the removal of the proposed Implementation Committee, and added the bullet point that the City review and consider restriction to Cluster Development. She asked Council for direction on the renaming of the areas currently listed as Old Town and New Town.

There was discussion between Manager Bailie and Council members concerning the need for a name designation for these 2 areas. Manager Bailie advised members that a name was needed in order to correspond to the description of this area in the Land Use Plan.

Council member Talbert discussed his concerns about the traffic congestion that already existed in these areas due to schools already located in these areas. He did not understand the reasoning for making this area a downtown with high density housing and felt this was a poor plan.

Ms. Booker asked if it was the objective of Council to identify names for the orange and pink area identified on the map. Manager Bailie advised Ms. Booker this was correct and that one of her suggestions included Center City Red and City Center Orange. Other names offered by Manager Bailie included Central Business District, and Business District South, City Center North and City Center South, Core Business District, Business District South. The descriptions are already located in the document. All that we need is a name to go with the descriptions.

Council member Labonte suggested Trinity, Downtown, Mayor Andrews discussed how NC Highway 62 ran north and south and suggested North Main and South Main. Council members Labonte and Ewings felt Mayor Andrew's idea was excellent. Council member Meredith questioned how this would separate the orange and red sections currently listed on the map. Manager Bailie advised Council members that she would add the new name designations of Main Street North (Red section) and Main Street South (Orange Section).

Manager Bailie asked if this name was agreeable to everyone. Council member Labonte asked if the zoning would remain the same all the way through these sections. Manager Bailie advised members that the Land Use was not zoning but that different areas within the Red and Orange Zoning had different descriptions. The descriptions listed in the document will remain the same, only the name will change.

Mayor Andrews called for general agreement to change the names to Main Street North and Main Street South.

At this time Council member Talbert asked again why the City would choose to build a downtown in this area. We are looking at building our City around our schools. He discussed his thoughts concerning the 2 I-85 exits where he felt the downtown areas should be located since it could be built and have no interference if access roads were run with rights of way being acquired from NCDOT.

It was Council member Reddick's opinion that the name did not mean that the plan could not be changed in 5 years.

Council member Bridges stated that she did not associate a downtown area location with an access road, but rather an area for highway commercial. Council member Meredith felt this plan would have to be refined as the city grew. Council member Labonte discussed the need to continue with this plan and agreed with earlier comments that the name did not matter and that as mentioned earlier since the plan will have revisions in the future.

Attorney Wilhoit discussed earlier conversations that took place concerning the sewer phases and the assured growth potential that would exist for the City. It was Council's hope that this would create some commercial development.

Council member Talbert advised members he was in favor of naming this area Commercial North and Commercial South. With this change he said that he would second a motion to approve the land use plan.

Density /Cluster Development

At this time there was discussion between Manager Bailie and Council members concerning cluster development and density associated with this type of development.

Manager Bailie discussed comments she had heard associated with this type of development. It was her opinion that it was the definition of terms that was causing the problems at this time. She used the following example: 100 acres with 100 homes with one (1) home on each acre is equivalent to R-40 zoning. When you take the same 100 homes and place them on 50 acres are the concerns about the density still the same or is the Council concerned about the lot size.

Council member Labonte felt that density should be placed in a certain area and leave it out of the countryside. He discussed one (1) of the items discussed when the Land Use Plan began. The persons attending the meetings stated that they wanted larger lot sizes. As the Land Use Plan evolved this item was pushed further back until Council does not even discuss this any more even though it was one (1) of the principal items listed.

Manager Bailie asked if the lot size was the concern more so than the density issue concerning this type of development. Council member Labonte stated yes because that was an item listed on the original Land Use Plan. Council member Meredith discussed the change in zoning that the City made to allow R-12 and felt that residents were misinformed and felt that this zoning would be allowed in the entire City.

Manager Bailie and Mr. Stumb discussed how Cluster Development worked. Manager Bailie advised Council that the density does not change when you take on a given property such as zoned RM or R12 which allows 3 units per acre and put the homes on smaller lot sizes (not 12,000 square foot lots) and still leave the open space. However, what I have heard is that the lot size is the problem.

Council member Talbert stated he felt the biggest problem was the run-off. He discussed the EPA report that defined less run-off in this type of development because less acreage was needed to build the same number of homes. According to this report if 87% of the land was left open and built the homes on the remaining 12-1/2 % there would be less run-off. The seven (7) homes per acre puts off 39,000, while one (1) house per acre puts off 18,000. It was his opinion that the problem in Trinity concerning this type of development was the flood plain areas. If high density developments are put in these areas there will be more run-off generated that will end up in the flood plain areas. The development that Council discussed during annexation would be in this category because of its proximity to the flood plain located in the area as well as the river in the area. The water would go into the river and end up in the flood plain areas throughout this area. It was his opinion that the City should pay attention to the flood plain areas. The one problem that we have seen in Trinity as a result of flooding is in the Mendenhall Road area. This road has washed out 3 times where the small creek crosses. We blame NCDOT. The first time the washout occurred and the bridge was replaced they put in a larger tile. It washed out again and was repaired with an even larger tile. It was his opinion that this occurred due to the development in this area. It was his opinion that the City did not need high density development along the flood plain areas.

Council member Bridges stated that she understood the concept of Cluster Development and agreed that there are persons who do not necessarily want large lots. I also agree that we should protect the flood plains, but I am not totally opposed to the concept of Cluster Development although I agree with Council member Labonte that we will end up with open space but with residents living in close proximity of each other.

Council member Talbert discussed the open space that had been offered with the proposed annexation development. The open space area was the flood plain along the river that he could not build on anyway. It was his opinion that developers would not dedicate a lot of open space unless they had to and in most of the cases in Trinity they will have to because of the location of the flood plains.

Council member Lambeth agreed with the validity of Council member Talbert's point concerning the washout of the bridge on Mendenhall. It was his opinion that the development that had taken place in High Point and Kingsfield had caused excessive run-off and caused the problems in this area.

Council member Talbert discussed the planning that was currently being done without taking Trinity as it currently exists. Trinity is hills and valleys and if you look at the streams and look at them coming to the center, between every stream is another hill and the stream itself is a valley.

Ms. Booker asked Council if topographical maps, site plans, and stormwater plans were required for developments. Manager Bailie stated that topographical maps were not required, however stormwater management plans were. Mr. McNeill stated that stormwater became an issue in relating to an impervious area in a watershed and was determined by a tract of land. It was his opinion that when the stormwater program was finalized that it would contain more stringent rules concerning pre- and post- development run-off. Post development runoff for certain rainfall events can not exceed pre-development runoff for an entire tract or any part of the tract.

There was discussion concerning the standards that were set by the State concerning run-off and stormwater ponds that had been approved and whether Council should consider more stringent rules regarding the standards previously set to exceed the State standards that require stormwater ponds be able to handle runoff consisting of one (1) inch of rain in one (1) hour or if other kinds of stormwater management should be explored as well.

Council member Talbert discussed a lake that was drained in his area and the damage that he felt had been caused in the creek in his neighborhood because the lake was drained. He felt the more impervious surface that was added upstream from this area the more water will be added to this creek.

There was discussion between Ms. Booker and Council members concerning their intent in regards to developing criteria that would succeed in avoiding sending a mixed signal to developers and that will help Council make the decisions to make the community a friendly place for good quality development.

Ms. Booker asked Council what information they would like to get that would help them decide where some smaller lot development is sustainable. Is there some information in your Land Use Plan based on soils, topography, and flood plain locations that suggest where more dense development might be allowed. After a brief discussion, Ms. Booker called on Attorney Wilhoit to assist Council in developing criteria for standards or quality.

Attorney Wilhoit discussed the legal problems that could result if the City did not develop consistent standards. He discussed the points brought up by Council member Talbert and his concerns with Cluster Development. The Council should be able to address what they can do to address their concerns. The key to this is to look at the problems and try to figure out what standards are acceptable by Council for this type of development. The Land Use Plan is frame work only and can be changed. Developers find consistency appealing and with established guidelines will attract developers that will want to come to Trinity to develop according to the standards set up. Certain cities are very restrictive with 2 of the most prominent being Pinehurst and Cary. The final decision depends on Council and the standards that you would like to see implemented with development.

Mr. McNeill discussed density and how it not only related to a per acre item but also related to the closeness of the development and how much impervious area was in one (1) location. By strengthening the Ordinances and requiring additional run-off control for more complex areas can solve the problem.

Council member Labonte discussed the need for input from the engineer that defined the impervious surface area that needed to be left in a high density development. Other comments from Council included the need to add verbiage to require more stringent water controls in this type development than is currently dictated by the State that should make this type of development work better and not create additional problems.

Ms. Booker discussed how other communities had dealt with higher density development and incorporated them into their Ordinances. They have added stricter run-off controls. It may be beneficial to get some examples of higher density sections from various Ordinances. They may be cluster development, or other types of development that requires stringent run-off controls. This will allow Council to review how other communities have done this. The other part of the issue is what places in Trinity are even hospitable to this type of development if Council develops criteria that they can agree on.

Manager Bailie said it was her understanding that while lot size was important, Council's focus was the amount of run-off that was generated from a high density development project. It is not so much the lot size or density if the run-off is adequately controlled. If the run-off issue is addressed is Council agreeable to considering smaller lot sizes in a given density. After discussion, some Council members felt it would be easier to explain to residents the reason to allow smaller lots if the run-off issue was addressed.

After further discussion between Ms. Booker and Council members concerning the needs that needed to be addressed there was general agreement on the following items:

- *To develop criteria that leads to consistency that will allow Trinity to become a community for high quality development*
- *Density units per acre- concerns seems to be more in regards to run-off rather than actual lot size*
- *Council felt that if runoff was addressed they would be open to some high density development in some defined areas of the City and that addressing the run-off in these areas would help Council explain to the citizens the reason for considering this type of development.*

****Action Item****

PTCOG Staff and City Staff work together to provide examples of High Density Development Ordinances from municipalities with similar topography with high standards addressing run-off controls for Council's review and consideration in establishing some type of guidelines and criteria for Trinity.

Steeplegate Properties Request

Manager Bailie discussed the information provided to Council concerning the proposal received from the Steeplegate Property Owners Association. This item is planned to be presented to Council in February.

Manager Bailie discussed an earlier request made by this group and the changes in the proposed request. This proposal asks that the City assume paying the electrical bill. Our Ordinance requires that the City pay the electric bill in all new subdivisions. They are offering to pay the adder charge. This is the difference between a decorative street light and the common street light. This amounts to approximately \$70,000.00. If this charge is paid one (1) time the charge will be satisfied and will not be a reoccurring charge. If the City will assume the payment of the electric bill they are willing to pay this adder charge. Mr. Stumb and Ms. Patterson, Duke Energy representative, have spent time in the neighborhood mapping the existing lights are located. The map provided to you gives you the location of the existing lights and where new lights are needed to meet our existing Ordinances. Waterford is a private road and not maintained by the City. We are recommending that the City not assume the eight (8) street lights along this road since this is private road.

If accepted the City will assume the power bill for 76 existing lights excluding the 8 located on Waterford but includes 23 additional lights identified to meet the City spacing requirements.

There was discussion concerning the current cost of the electric bill. Manager Bailie advised members the current charge was \$6.33 per light and is a little less than the yellow lights that the City requires in new subdivision. We have been advised by Duke Energy that there is basically no difference in the illumination of these two (2) lights when considering their use in this development and would not be an issue.

There was discussion concerning why this policy would not apply to other citizens that currently pay for street lighting. Some of the reasons discussed was the fact that the lighting was not located on City Streets and usually were located on private property as well as the lack of uniformity (types) of lights that existed.

Review

The following comments were generated concerning the Annual Retreat.

Council member Ewings: Felt the Retreat allowed Council to discuss items in a more relaxed atmosphere that seemed to allow individuals to better express their opinions and thoughts.

Council member Lambeth: Felt that a lot of the items touched on today during the Retreat such as ETJ, fell into the Strategic Issues categories.

Ms. Booker shared her feelings concerning the strategic issues. The City is almost at a point in your development where you are beginning to receive lots of pressures. You have not yet quite defined your proactive planning to the point that it will be ahead of the pressure but you are about to address this by adopting a Land Use Plan, beginning to look at some ETJ Policies, and are beginning to start looking at some Ordinances that can help the City formulate their own run-off and high density development criteria. Once you complete these items you can be pro-active and inviting at the same time.

Mayor Andrews: discussed her concerns and earlier conversations with Manager Bailie about the Surret Drive areas. It was her opinion that this was a primary target area for future commercial development if sewer service could be provided and could possibly benefit the City with future economic development projects.

Adjournment

With no other business to discuss at the Annual Retreat, *motion by Council member Ewings to adjourn the City of Trinity Annual Retreat at 3:45:12 pm, seconded by Council member Meredith and approved unanimously by all Council members present.*

These minutes were approved as written at the May 15, 2007 Regular City Council Meeting upon motion by Council member Bridges, seconded by Council member Reddick and approved unanimously by all Council members present.